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Reviewer’s report:

Comments to the Authors:

The case of a renal capsule metastasis from renal pelvic cancer is interesting.

However, the authors should consider the following points:

Major comments:

Background:

The authors declare this case as being "rare", however, no literature search on this topic has been provided.

Case presentation:

Please explain the type of endocrine therapy which was applied for the breast cancer.

Please consider describing the sampled blood tests more accurately. "Almost all blood tests being normal" does not add relevant information to this case.

Concerning the patient’s death, please declare the details of "disease progression"

In general, no patient’s clinical features except for tumor-features have been offered. Please include more data.

Discussion

Please gather more information regarding other relevant literature on renal capsule tumors. Reduce general well known facts on histopathology of urothelial cancers.

Minor comments:
Try to re-arrange the contents of the case presentation in order to increase readability and comprehensibleness regarding the origin of the renal capsule metastasis early in the text. It can be easily mistaken as being a metastasis of the previously described breast cancer.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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